

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-25 are pending in the application. By this paper claims 2 and 17 have been cancelled and claims 1, 7, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 23 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the application including claims 1, 3-6 and 8-25 in light of the amendments and arguments herein are respectfully requested.

**Amendments to the Specification and Abstract**

**Compact Disc Submission**

The application was filed with a computer program source code Appendix included on pages A1-A38 with the application. The Office Action has required submission of this Appendix on a compact disc in conformance 37 CFR § 1.96(c). By this paper, the application has been amended by canceling pages A1-A38 as originally filed and by inserting a reference at the beginning of the Specification in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.77(b)(4). Filed concurrently herewith are two identical copies of a compact disc including, in the format specified in 37 CFR § 1.96(c), the content of the computer program source code appendix substantially as previously filed in hard copy form on pages A1-A38. No new matter is added by this amendment. This amendment merely conforms the Specification to the currently-required format for submission of computer program listings.

**Trademark Usage**

The Office Action has required correction of the use of the trademark “JAVA” in the application. Accordingly the application has been amended at pages 9 and 17 to ensure that the mark JAVA is capitalized wherever it appears and is accompanied by appropriate generic terminology.

Further, many references of the term “pay for performance” database have been corrected in the Specification including the drawing and Abstract. Applicant has elsewhere used the term

Application no. 09/575,894  
Amendment dated: September 9, 2003  
Reply to office action dated: May 9, 2003

PAY FOR PERFORMANCE as a trademark and has substituted herein the more generic term “pay for placement” database for the trademark term used in the originally filed specification. Pay for placement is a generic term to describe a bidden search listing database. No new matter is added by this amendment. Rather, the terminology is changed consistently throughout the application in order to reflect the proprietary nature of the PAY FOR PERFORMANCE.

Entry of these amendments to the Specification and removal of any objections thereto are respectfully requested.

#### Amendments to the Claims

For the reasons noted above with respect to the amendments to the specification, several claims have been amended to correct reference to a PAY FOR PERFORMANCE database. The generic usage “pay for placement” has been substituted. Other claims have been amended to correct minor informalities noted during review of the claims.

#### Prior art rejections

##### Claims 1-22

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent number 6,421,675 B1 to Ryan, et al. (“Ryan”). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to distinguish the inventions defined by these claims over the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites a method of generating a search result list, in part using a pay for placement database. The method includes “identifying related search listings.” As amended, this includes searching an inverted index of data obtained using search listings of a pay for placement database and searching meta-information obtained by analyzing search listings of the pay for performance database. The specification as filed explains at page 12, lines 14-17, explains that for one embodiment

In an inverted index, a single index entry is used to reference many database records. Searching for multiple matches per index entry is generally faster when using inverted indexes, since each index entry may reference many database records. The inverted index lists the words which can be searched in, for example, alphabetical order and accompanying each word are pointers which identify the particular documents which contain the word as well as the locations within each document at which the word occurs. To perform a search, instead of searching through the documents in word order, the computer locates the pointers for the particular words identified in a search query and processes them.

Moreover, the specification explains at page 13, lines 1-14, explains that for one embodiment

Meta-information is obtained using a script of command to analyze the pay for performance data base and determine information and relationships present in the data. The meta-information is collected for each row of data in the database and attached to that row. In one embodiment, the script is run one time as a batch process after the data is collected in the database. In other embodiments, the script is periodically re-run to update the meta-information.

Meta-information about the web pages and key words contained in the pay for performance database includes information such as the frequency of occurrence of similar key words among different web site domains and the number of different key words associated with a single web site. The meta-information may further include fielded advertiser data which is the information contained in each search listing provided by web site promoters who have bid upon search terms in the pay for performance database; advertiser identification information; web site themes, such as gambling or adult content;; and derived themes.

Ryan fails to include these limitations. Ryan discloses a system including a keyword table 164 (FIG. 5, Table 1, column 27 line 60 – column 28 line 8). The keyword table is populated with keywords entered by other users performing searches. Ryan makes no suggestion that an inverted index is produced or searched. Regarding the claimed meta-information, the office action makes reference to column 31, lines 25-50. However, this portion of Ryan only shows a reference to a keyword content table which contains tallies of data such as “cumulative hits for one month.” Ryan does not disclose determining information and relationships present in search listings, as require by amended claim 1.

Accordingly, since claim 1 recites limitations nowhere disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by Ryan, this reference can not anticipate claim 1, which is therefore allowable. Claims 3-14 are dependent from claim 1 and add further limitations thereto and are allowable for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 3-14 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 15- 19, claim 15 has been amended to distinguish the invention defined by this claim over Ryan. Claim 15 as amended recites a system including a related search database which includes a plurality of related search listings. Each related search listing includes a keyword associated with one document of a pay for placement database and text of the one document.

Ryan fails to disclose a related search database including related search listings which include text of documents referenced by keywords stored in the database of Ryan. Ryan only operates on keywords and some other information, such as a money bid amount ("bid", column 31, lines 34-36).

Accordingly, since Ryan fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claim 15, this reference can not anticipate this claim, which is therefore allowable. Claims 16 and 18-19 are dependent from claim 15 and are allowable for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 15, 16 and 18-19 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 20-22, the rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 20 includes limitations not present in Ryan. Specifically, claim 20 recites "storing in a related search database entry text from each web page referenced by" a pay for placement search listing, creating an inverted index and creating an index for key information. As noted above, Ryan does not operate on text but only on keywords and some other information of search listings. Ryan does not disclose storing text of a search listing or creating an index of key information.

Accordingly, since Ryan fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claim 20, this reference can not anticipate this claim, which is therefore allowable. Claims 21 and 22 are dependent from claim 20 and are allowable for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 20-23 is respectfully requested.

#### Claims 23-25

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. patent number 5,999,929 to Goodman ("Goodman").

Independent claim 23 has been amended to distinguish the invention defined by this claim over Goodman. As amended, claim 23 recites

determining if a URL on the list is similar to another URL on the list;  
if the URL is not similar to another URL on the list, adding the URL to a list of URLs to  
be crawled;

Support for this amendment is found at FIG. 7, blocks 712 and 718 of the application.

Application no. 09/575,894  
Amendment dated: September 9, 2003  
Reply to office action dated: May 9, 2003

Goodman fails to recite these limitations. Accordingly, claim 23 is allowable over this reference. Claims 24 and 25 are dependent from claim 23 and add further limitations thereto and are allowable for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claims 23-25 is therefore respectfully requested.

With this response, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



John G. Rauch  
Registration No. 37,218  
Attorney for Applicant

September 9, 2003  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200